

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed May 5, 2008 ("Office Action"). Claims 1-18 are pending in the Application and stand rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 Rejections

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, the Office Action alleges that the claim limitations containing the term "subject to rounding" are indefinite and confusing and further, that there is "no explanation in the Specification or the Drawings on how this limitation works" in the claimed invention. *See* Office Action at ¶ 3. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Application, including the specification and drawings, demonstrates that the claims (including the term "subject to rounding") define the subject matter sought to be patented with a "reasonable degree of particularity and distinctness." M.P.E.P. § 2173.02. Moreover, the test for claim definiteness is whether the claim, as a whole, "appraises one of ordinary skill in the art of its scope." *Id.* Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims meet the test for claim definiteness as mandated by the M.P.E.P. For example, the Application indicates that a combination of power connectors for a power distribution block may include, for instance:

four groups of approximately 1/6 and four groups of approximately 1/12 of the total number of connectors. As is often the case, the total number of power connectors is not evenly divided, i.e. the total number of power connectors is not divisible by 12. Preferably, the groups are divided as closely as possible to 1/6 and 1/12 and so that various combinations of groups can be arranged so that within each set of grouping combinations, the combinations of groups differ by no more than one power combination. Application at [0040] (emphasis added); *see also id.* at Figs. 5-1 and 5-2.

Based at least on the foregoing disclosure, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily ascertain the scope of the present claims, including the term "subject to rounding." Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the § 112 rejections be withdrawn from claims 1-18.

The Office Action Fails to Show Each and Every Element of Amended Claim 1 in *Quin*

Claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,500,796 to *Quin* ("*Quin*"). However, it has not been shown that *Quin* teaches or suggests multiple features of, for example, amended claim 1, as required by the patent laws and the M.P.E.P. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131.

For instance, amended claim 1 recites a power distribution system for a computing system with "a terminal block comprising a plurality of power distribution terminals, each terminal connected to a group of at least one of the connectors, each terminal arranged to receive a first set of grouping combinations of power connectors, the first set having a first power input, and a second set of grouping combinations of power connectors different from the first set." Such a feature, in certain implementations, may allow the power distribution system to be easily configured to work with different electrical loads, different power supply inputs, and/or changing power supply requirements of the computing system over its useful life.

Quin, in contrast, is directed to a system for interconnecting lighting fixtures to independently and selectively control such fixtures. *See Quin* at Abstract. More specifically, *Quin* teaches that multiple cable assemblies 19 may interconnect lighting fixtures 3 to carry electrical power to the fixtures. *See id.* at 7:56-8:2; Fig. 1. Each cable assembly 19 includes a male plug 21 and a female receptacle 23. The male plug 21 of the cable assembly 19 may be plugged into a lighting fixture 3 while the female receptacle 23 of the cable assembly 19 may be plugged into an adjacent lighting fixture 3, thereby interconnecting the fixtures. *See id.* at 8:19-51. The interconnected lighting fixtures receive electrical power from a panelboard 13, which is connected to an AC power supply service. *See id.* at 7:56-60. The power supply is routed to the lighting fixtures though the aforementioned cable assemblies 19 and various switching cable assemblies 25. *See id.* at 8:18-51; Figs. 1-4.

Quin does not suggest, let alone disclose, a terminal block comprising a plurality of power distribution terminal as recited in amended claim 1. To the extent the panelboard 13 of the *Quin* system receives AC power and transfers the power to the lighting fixtures of its system, *Quin* does not suggest that this component includes multiple power distribution terminals where

each terminal receives two different sets of grouping combinations of power connectors. Applicants submit, therefore, that *Quin* does not teach a terminal block as recited in amended claim 1 through the panelboard 13 of its system.

Even further, amended claim 1 recites that the terminal block is “configured to distribute the first and second power inputs substantially evenly among the sets of grouping combinations.” In contrast, *Quin*'s system appears designed to route varying amounts of power to particular sets of lighting fixtures depending on the number of fixtures in each set. *See Quin* at Fig. 1 (showing a set of four fixtures and a set of seven fixtures). Thus, any component of *Quin*'s system that distributes power inputs substantially evenly among sets of lighting fixtures may not otherwise supply the necessary power to the sets of fixtures. In short, *Quin* appears to rely on the ability to deliver varying amounts of power to the sets of lighting fixtures wired in series rather than an even distribution of power among such sets.

Accordingly, as it has not been shown that *Quin* discloses each and every limitation of amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that amended claim 1 be allowed over the § 102(b) rejections. Independent claim 10, as amended, includes certain aspects analogous to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants also respectfully request claim 10 be allowed over the § 102(b) rejections.

The Dependent Claims Are Not Obvious in Light of *Quin*

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Quin*. But as set forth above, it has not been shown that *Quin*, alone or in any combination, teaches each and every element of, for example, amended claim 1. Further, the Office Action has not shown any suggestion or motivation to modify *Quin* to include such a feature. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143.01 (“Obviousness can be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so.”). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 2-9, which depend from amended claim 1. Independent claim 10, as amended, includes certain aspects analogous to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 11-18, which depend from amended claim 10.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all claims.

Any circumstance in which the Applicants have (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the Applicants concede other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the Applicants concede any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

A Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and required fee of \$810 is being filed concurrently herewith. A Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 along with the required fee of \$120 is submitted concurrently herewith. No other fees are believed to be due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any other deficiencies or required fees or any credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 5, 2008

/Hans R. Troesch/

Hans R. Troesch
Reg. No. 36,950

PTO Customer No. 26192

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (612) 335-5070

Facsimile: (877) 769-7945